



**University of  
Zurich**<sup>UZH</sup>

**Zurich Open Repository and  
Archive**

University of Zurich  
University Library  
Strickhofstrasse 39  
CH-8057 Zurich  
[www.zora.uzh.ch](http://www.zora.uzh.ch)

---

Year: 2012

---

## **The “recipient passive” in West Slavic: A calque from German and its grammaticalization**

Giger, Markus

**Abstract:** Among the European languages with a participial passive, there are some that tend to distinguish dynamic passive and object resultative through the use of different auxiliaries, e.g. English, Italian or German. In German, the difference is obligatory, and the German difference between the werden-passive and the sein-resultative had an influence on several neighboring languages (Polish, Sorbian, Swiss Rotoromansh, Hungarian). Only partly compatible with this area, there is another subarea in which a recipient passive is built by using verbs with the meaning ‘get’ as auxiliaries. Again, the origin has to be sought in German, but more or less grammaticalized recipient passives can be found in Sorbian (with the auxiliary borrowed in dialects and calqued in the standard), Czech, and Slovak (the auxiliary is a calque here). In the paper, corpus material from Upper Sorbian is compared to former descriptions of the recipient passive in Czech and Slovak, all by taking into account the situation in different varieties of German. As a result of the comparison, it seems that there is stronger grammaticalization of the recipient passive in Sorbian dialects than in Czech, which is probably due to the fact that the Sorbian construction came into being earlier than the Czech one (evidence from 19th-century Upper Sorbian and Czech is given in the paper). While in Sorbian the construction perfectly resembles its German counterpart (including differences in grammaticalization and style between dialectal use and use in the standard language), in Czech there are some peculiarities in the choice of the full verbs used in the recipient passive that do not agree with either Standard German or East Middle German dialects. For these reasons, the process leading to the formation of the recipient passive can be analyzed as polysemy copying in Sorbian, but as replica grammaticalization in Czech. The recipient passive in Slovak seems to be dependent on Czech rather than on German.

Posted at the Zurich Open Repository and Archive, University of Zurich  
ZORA URL: <https://doi.org/10.5167/uzh-80475>  
Book Section

Originally published at:

Giger, Markus (2012). The “recipient passive” in West Slavic: A calque from German and its grammaticalization. In: Wiemer, Björn; Wälchli, Bernhard; Hansen, Björn. Grammatical replication and borrowability in language contact. Berlin-New York: De Gruyter, 559-588.

# 13. The “recipient passive” in West Slavic: A calque from German and its grammaticalization

*Markus Giger*

## 1. Introduction

According to Haspelmath (1998: 275, 2001: 1496f.), the participial passive can be considered an areal feature of the European language area (Standard Average European, SAE). Originally a genetic feature of the Indo-European languages, it spread to non-Indo-European languages of Europe such as Maltese and Hungarian (Csató 1994: 243; Haspelmath 1998: 276). Often this participial passive is homonymous to a certain degree with the object resultative construction in a given language (cf. Nedjalkov and Jaxontov 1988: 45-49; Giger 2003a: 70-76, 469-478; Wiemer and Giger 2005: 9-10), but among the European languages with a passive of this kind, there are several that tend to distinguish dynamic passive and object resultative by use of different auxiliaries: cf. the English *get* - and *be*-passive,<sup>1</sup> or the Italian *venire*- and *essere*-passive.<sup>2</sup> It is important to see that in either case the construction with a verb meaning ‘to be’ is ambiguous, while the former construction is passive (dynamic) only. The use of the non-ambiguous passive is not compulsory in either English or Italian. German has a fully grammaticalized dynamic passive different from the objective resultative, built with the auxiliary *werden* ‘become’, while the object resultative is constructed with *sein* ‘be’. The difference is obligatory. The non-ambiguous passives in English, Italian or German are younger developments in comparison to the constructions with *be*-auxiliaries. From the point of view of language contact it is important to see that the difference between *werden*-passive and *sein*-resultative in German had an influence on several neighboring languages. These languages therefore build a sub-area among the European languages with the participial passive: Polish uses the auxiliary *zostać* ‘become’ in the passive and the auxiliary *być* ‘be’ in the resultative,<sup>3</sup> Non-Standard Sorbian the loan *wordować* (< German *werden*, cf. Wiemer/Giger 2005: 101f.),<sup>4</sup> Swiss Retoromansh does not use a passive auxiliary meaning *become*, but the full grammaticalization of *vegnir* ‘come’ as (almost)<sup>5</sup> obligatory in the dynamic passive (Spescha 1989: 413-416, 427f.) is certainly a result of heavy

German influence (parallelling Retoromansh *vegnir* to German *werden*, cf. by contrast the non-compulsory use reported in Italian).<sup>6</sup> Finally, the substandard Hungarian passive with the auxiliary *lesz* ‘become’, as reported by Csátó (1994: 243), recalls the German dynamic passive again (although the infinite form used is a gerund in *-va/-ve*, not a passive participle).<sup>7</sup>

There is another subarea in which a recipient passive is built by using verbs with the meaning ‘get’ as auxiliaries. In German, there exists an analytical passive construction built by the auxiliary *kriegen/bekommen/erhalten* and a passive participle, cf. *Sie bekommt/kriegt/erhält den Katalog zugeschickt* ‘She gets the catalogue sent’ (Diewald 1997: 34). A similar construction can be found in Czech, Sorbian, and Slovak (Giger 2003b):

- (1) Czech:  
*Dostal jsem doporučen pobyt na*  
 get.PAST AUX.1.SG recommend.PTC.PASS.M.SG stay M.SG at  
*venkově.*  
 countryside  
 ‘I was recommended a stay in the countryside.’
- (2) Slovak:  
*Dostal som nariadené, aby som*  
 get.PAST AUX.1.SG impose.PTC.PASS.N.SG CONJ AUX.1.SG  
*ti zagrataloval.*  
 you congratulate.  
 ‘I was told to congratulate you.’
- (3) Upper Sorbian:  
*Wón dóstanje wot wšitkich pomhane*  
 He get.3.SG.PRES from all help.PTC.PASS.N.SG  
 ‘He is helped by everyone.’
- (4) Lower Sorbian:  
*Tu rědnu wazu how som wot swojeje*  
 DEM nice vase F.SG.ACC here AUX.1.SG from POSS  
*sotše darjonu.acc krydnuł*  
 sister present.PTC.PASS.F.SG get.PERF  
 ‘This nice vase I was given by my sister.’

Similar to German, the four West Slavic languages use verbs meaning ‘get’ as auxiliaries: Czech *dostat*, Slovak *dostať*, Upper Sorbian *krydnyć*, *dóstać*, Lower Sorbian *krydnuś*, *dostaś*. Sorbian *krydnyć* and *krydnuś* are direct loans from German *kriegen*. In all four languages there is, unlike in German, agreement in case, number and gender between the direct object and the participle. The participle shows accusative case, as the direct object does, while the subject of the sentence is in the nominative case.

In my paper I will first give a short description of the recipient passive in German, including citations of criteria of its grammaticalization, and then turn to the recipient passive constructions in Czech and Slovak described in former articles of mine (Giger 2003b, 2004). The greater part of the present paper will be dedicated to the recipient passive in Upper Sorbian, where extensive new corpus material is analyzed. By comparing the recipient passive of Upper Sorbian to its Czech counterpart, I will try to show that there is stronger grammaticalization of the recipient passive in Sorbian dialects than in Czech, which is probably due to the fact that the Sorbian construction came into being earlier than the Czech one. At the same time, the use in Standard Upper Sorbian resembles the use of Standard German and there are no significant differences in the degree of grammaticalization in comparison to Czech. It will be argued that the recipient passive in Sorbian might have developed in a parallel manner to the recipient passive in German (Sorbian dialects copying the development in neighboring German dialects, Standard Upper Sorbian copying the use of the recipient passive in Standard German), while the Czech construction seems to be an instance of replica grammaticalization and to have arisen in Colloquial and/or Standard Czech rather than in Czech dialects. All this has to be seen in connection with the fact that Sorbian was influenced much more extensively by German than Czech was.

## 2. The recipient passive in German

Diewald (1997: 30f.) compares the grammaticalization of the recipient passive in German to other relevant constructions, especially the direct passive with *werden*. The basis of the recipient passive construction is the specific diathesis of the synonymous verbs *bekommen*, *kriegen*, *erhalten*, whose surface subject is the semantic recipient (Diewald 1997: 33). Diewald describes a transitional state of the construction, which is reflected by the fact that in Standard German the construction is more restricted than

in Colloquial German (Diewald 1997: 32) and that not all speakers accept all examples as grammatical (Diewald 1997: 36).

According to Diewald the grammaticalization of the German recipient passive started with sentences in which the verb *bekommen* retained its full meaning and the participle functioned as a verbal attribute: *Sie bekommt/kriegt/erhält die Bretter schon passend zugeschnitten* 'She gets the boards already cut up suitably' (Diewald 1997: 32f.). It is these kind of sentences that are accepted in more conservative grammars of Standard German. The ongoing grammaticalization of the construction leads to sentences in which the participle can no longer be considered a verbal attribute, but instead builds a complex verbal form together with the verb *bekommen*. The participial verb imposes its valencies, which can be demonstrated by the fact that the construction combines with complements with which the verb *bekommen* itself does not combine (*Sie bekommt/kriegt/erhält geschrieben, dass das Treffen verschoben wird*, literally 'She gets written, that the meeting will be delayed'), or can even stand without a complement at all (*Sie bekommt geschrieben* 'She gets mail' lit. '...gets mailed/written'; Diewald 1997: 35). The participle on the other hand, a non-obligatory complement in the original construction, can no longer be left out (*\*Sie bekommt/kriegt erhält (von ihm), dass das Treffen verschoben ist*, a.a.O.: 38). The construction is built from verbs with privative meaning, which cannot be combined with the full verb *bekommen* (*Er bekommt/kriegt das Auto weggenommen* 'He gets his car taken away'), and from verbs without an accusative complement (*Er bekommt/kriegt geschmeichelt/geholfen/auf die Füße getreten/geschimpft*, literally 'He gets flattered/helped/ trodden on his foot/insulted'), cf. Diewald (1997: 36, 38f., 41). Sentences without an object have the lowest acceptance and occur very seldom in texts (Askedal 1984: 28, 31).

Ebert (1978: 63f.; cited here according to Vogel 2006: 214) distinguishes four stages of development in grammaticalization of the recipient passive: I. sentences in which the auxiliary retains its meaning and the participle functions as a verbal attribute, II. sentences with complements other than accusative, III. sentences containing verbs with privative meaning, IV. sentences containing verbs that do not have an accusative complement at all. These criteria can be viewed in the broader context of grammaticalization criteria for emerging analytical verbal forms as described in Giger (2006): formal differences between original full verb and new auxiliary (which cannot be observed in the West Slavic recipient passive so far), change of valency behavior (cf. II., IV.), combining of the

auxiliary with full verbs that are in semantic opposition to the original meaning of the auxiliary (cf. III.), combining of the auxiliary with the etymologically identical full verb (not applicable to the recipient passive), obligatoriness of the construction (cannot be observed in the West Slavic recipient passive so far), non-use of the construction leading to the exclusion of its meaning (not applicable in the case of voice-constructions), word order restrictions that do not occur with comparable free syntagms (very marginal for the West Slavic recipient passive), restrictions for combinations of the auxiliary with full verbs and frequency in text. The last two criteria in combination with those that can be connected with Ebert’s stages will be used in the present paper. This corresponds quite well to Wiemer’s (2004: 314-319) conclusions on grammaticalization criteria applicable in the evolution of North Slavic and Baltic (direct) participial passives.

The recipient passive is not a very frequent construction in Standard German: Štícha (2004: 396) reports that in the corpus Cosmas I of the Institute of German Language in Mannheim the non-problematic *geschenkt bekommen* ‘get as a gift’ was found only 28 times. In the larger corpus Cosmas II containing more than a billion words, it was found almost 900 times, but several other verbs (*angeordnet bekommen* ‘get imposed’, *vermietet bekommen* ‘get rented’, *versprochen bekommen* ‘get promised’, *vorgeschlagen bekommen* ‘get proposed’) were not found in the older corpus (Cosmas I) at all and there was little evidence of them, only from a few examples, in the larger one.

Until recently, there was no research on the German recipient passive from the diachronic or dialectological viewpoint. This made it difficult to make assumptions about the time and place of the presumed German impact on the building of the West Slavic recipient passive (cf. Giger 2003b: 100). This situation has changed with a recent article by Elvira Glaser (2005: 43) in which she reports that the recipient passive has been attested in German beginning at the end of the 16th century. While at the beginning it was built only with the verb *kriegen*, the verb *bekommen* has been used since the 17th century (Glaser 2005: 45). The oldest examples belong mostly to the Middle German dialect area. It is this dialect area in which the recipient passive seems to be most frequent and most grammaticalized today: “The fact that the construction is apparently well-attested from Luxembourgian across Palatinate dialects to Middle Eastern German dialects fits well with the role attributed to Middle German during the forming of the *kriegen*-passive, at least if it is assumed that today’s

popularity of the construction with several types of verbs is a reflex of a longer grammaticalization process”<sup>8</sup> (Glaser 2005: 47f.). It is these dialects that use the recipient passive even with verbs without an accusative object such as *helfen*. The recipient passive is not unknown in Upper German dialects, but it seems to be less frequent and less grammaticalized (e. g. informants do not accept verbs with privative meaning or two-place-verbs like *helfen* in the recipient passive), and there seems to be a decline of frequency and intensity of grammaticalization from North to South, which ends in Swiss German dialects, where the recipient passive probably exists only as a new calque from Standard German.<sup>9</sup> There are two more dialectal remarks from Glaser that are important for the question of German – West Slavic language contact: First, the recipient passive has been attested as common in Egerländisch, a former North Upper German (Bavarian) dialect of Western Bohemia concentrated around the town of Cheb (Glaser 2005: 48). Second, in the database of the Österreichisches Wörterbuch, there are several examples for the recipient passive from former German dialects of Bohemia and Moravia (Glaser 2005: 49).

### 3. The recipient passive in Czech and Slovak

The Czech recipient passive was first analyzed by Daneš in 1968 and 1976. Daneš states that the recipient passive is built from verbs with a dative valency, which can be the only one (*vyhubovat*, *vynadat* ‘tell off’, *nabít*, *nařezat* ‘thrash’) or can be combined with a further valency. In the second case this further valency can be an infinitive clause (or a subordinate clause with a finite verb) or an accusative. The accusative valency can be obligatory or not. Most verbs from which the recipient passive in Czech is built are transfer verbs: *darovat*, *nadělit* ‘present’, *dodat*, *doručit*, *udělit*, *uštědřit* ‘deliver, dispense, grant’, *nahradit* ‘compensate’, *poskytnout* ‘give, afford’, *postoupit* ‘cede, submit’, *poukázat* ‘remit, transfer’, *přenechat* ‘leave, entrust’, *přidělit* ‘allot, assign’, *proplatit* ‘discharge’, *půjčit* ‘lend’, *svěřit* ‘confide’, *věnovat* ‘devote, dedicate’, *vrátit* ‘return’, *vyměnit* ‘exchange’, *vyplatit* ‘pay out’. Two large semantic groups are verbs with the meaning ‘give a person a hiding’ like *nabít*, *namlátit*, *naplácat*, *namlít*, *nařezat*, *nasekat*, *natlouct* etc., and verbs meaning ‘tell off, reproach’ like *vycinkat*, *vyčinit*, *vyhubovat*, *vylát*, *(vy-)nadat* etc. A further group would be three-place speech act verbs like *doporučit* ‘recommend’, *nabídnout* ‘offer’, *nadiktovat*, *nakázat*, *nařídít* ‘charge a person with something’,

*navrhnout* ‘propose’, *poradit* ‘advise’, *předepsat* ‘prescribe’, *umožnit* ‘make possible, enable’, *domluvit* ‘reprove’. At least some verbs of information transfer, such as *odpovědět* ‘answer’, *oznámit* ‘announce’, *sdělit* ‘communicate’, *vysvětlit* ‘explain’ and *signalizovat* ‘signalize’, *telefonovat* ‘phone’, *telegrafovat* ‘telegraph, cable’. The verbs *slibit* ‘promise’ and *poděkovat* ‘thank’ are apart. The recipient passive in Czech can be built also with the imperfective auxiliary *dostávat*.

In Giger (2003b: 89-95) I analyzed the evidence for the recipient passive from the Czech National Corpus.<sup>10</sup> A search in the partial corpus SYN2000, extended by searches in the Prague and Brno corpora of spoken Czech, offered about 500 examples of *dostat* + participle and 40 examples of *dostávat* + participle.<sup>11</sup> Most examples (nearly 75%) are from verbs denominating financial transactions:

- (5) *V této zemi se člověk narodí a dostane za to zaplaceno.*  
 In this country a man is born and get.3.SG.PRES for this pay.PTC. PASS.N.SG  
 ‘In this country a man is born and gets paid for that.’
- (6) *Za tohle by měl dostat přinejmenším přidáno.*  
 For this he should get.INF at least raise-wages.PTC. PASS.N.SG  
 ‘For this he should at least get his wages raised.’

The verbs with the meaning ‘tell off’, ‘reproach’ and ‘give a person a hiding’ are represented by nearly 14%,<sup>12</sup> while other speech act verbs have only a few examples (around 3%):

- (7) *Prokop byl trochu bledý a statečně čekal, že dostane vynadáno.*  
 P. was a bit pale and waited bravely that get.3.SG.PRES tell-off.PTC. PASS.N.SG  
 ‘Prokop was a bit pale and waited bravely to be told off.’
- (8) *Dostali jsme nařízeno zabíjet*  
 get.PRET AUX.1.PL direct.PTC. PASS.N.SG kill.INF



*vlky, kde se dá (...)*  
 wolf.ACC.PL, wherever possible  
 ‘We were directed to kill wolves, wherever possible.’

Several verbs alleged by Daneš as possible in the Czech recipient passive construction were not found in the corpus, and none of the verbs designated by him as doubtful were found.<sup>13</sup>

Until recently there were no references to the existence of the recipient passive in Slovak (in one case the reference is negative, the existence of the recipient passive is denied).<sup>14</sup> Research in the Slovak National Corpus<sup>15</sup>, however, showed, that there is evidence for the construction: in the 30-million-words corpus “Nitra”, I was able to find 56 examples. While it is therefore quite evident that the frequency of the construction is lower in Slovak than in Czech, the most prominent semantic group of verbs building the construction is the same, verbs designating financial transactions:

- (9) *Toto som dostal zaplatené ešte predtým,*  
 This AUX.1.SG get.PRET pay.PTC. PASS.N.SG yet before  
*celkom slušne (...)*  
 quite well  
 ‘For this I got paid before yet, quite well.’

While the verbs designating ‘tell off’, ‘reproach’ and ‘give a person a hiding’ are lacking in the evidence from the Slovak National Corpus (although at least the first group can be documented from written use, cf. Giger 2004: 38), there are some examples for speech act verbs meaning ‘recommend, offer, charge, propose’. The dependence of the Slovak recipient passive on its Czech counterpart is quite obvious: there is no verb in the Slovak examples that could not be found among the Czech ones as well.<sup>16</sup>

#### 4. The recipient passive in Sorbian<sup>17</sup>

My description of the Sorbian recipient passive (Giger 2003b: 95-98) is based on the literature available (mainly Löttsch 1968, 1969; Fasske/Michalk 1981: 221-224). In addition to verbs used in the Czech recipient passive, among the examples for the Sorbian recipient passive were verbs that are not attested (and mostly not acceptable either) in the Czech construction but that are well known from (some varieties of)

German. Cf. *pomhać* 'to help', *prajić* 'to say', *preč wzać* 'to take away', *spusćić* 'to release', *wodać* 'to forgive', *wotrubać*, *wotćeć* 'to chop off, decapitate'. In particular, the verbs with privative semantics document the more advanced grammaticalization of the construction in Sorbian.

In the meantime, I had the opportunity to extend this description using material from the Upper Sorbian Electronic Corpus<sup>18</sup>, which should make the results for this language more comparable to the results for Czech and Slovak, based on the respective national corpus. First of all, the Upper Sorbian Corpus is smaller than its Czech counterpart. Although exact data for the Upper Sorbian Corpus are not available, it might be sufficient to compare the relative frequency of the verbs meaning 'to get' in both corpora.<sup>19</sup> While in SYN2000 *dostat* occurs nearly 70,000 times and *dostávat* 12,500 times, there are 4,850 forms of *dostać* and 652 forms of *dóstawać* in the Upper Sorbian Corpus. As concerns the recipient passive, there are 76 examples for the construction *dostać* + participle in the Upper Sorbian Corpus, 1 example for the construction with the imperfective *dóstawać* + participle and 5 examples for the dialectal *kry(d)nyć* + participle (the verb *kry(d)nyć* occurs only seldom in the corpus, virtually only in collections of folklore). The proportion between the verbs *dostávat/dostat* and the recipient passive in SYN2000 is therefore 1: 0,0066, while in the Upper Sorbian corpus the proportion between the verbs *dóstawać/dostać* and the recipient passive is 1: 0,014 (the dialectal examples with *kry(d)nyć* are not considered). The relative frequency of the recipient passive in the Upper Sorbian Corpus is therefore two times higher than in the Czech National Corpus.<sup>20</sup>

The recipient passive in the Upper Sorbian Corpus appears with the following verbs (frequency is adduced in parentheses if it is higher than one): *darić* 'present' (11), *diktować* 'dictate' (2), *dowolić* 'allow', *nabřenić* 'burden', *naliwać* 'pour', *namuzować* 'force', *plaćić* 'pay' (3), *pokazać* 'show', *poskićić* 'give, afford', *pósłać* 'send', *postajić* 'stand, place', *požćić* 'lend' (2), *prajić* 'say', *předpołożyć* 'submit, present' (2), *přepodać* 'hand over, confer' (3), *přepokazać* 'transfer', *přidžělić* 'allot, assign' (6), *připokazać* 'allocate', *připósłać* 'send' (11), *přizwolić* 'approve' (3), *ramować* 'frame up', *skrótšić* 'trim, reduce', *sposředkować* 'convey', *spušćić* 'abate, forgive' (2), *trjechić* 'strike, hit', *wobkrućić* 'confirm' (2), *wodać* 'forgive', *wopodstatnić* 'give reasons for something, substance to something', *wumyć* 'clean', *wuprajić* 'express', *zaplaćić* 'pay' (5), *zarunać* 'compensate, refund' (3), *zapisać* 'register', *zaščěpić* 'inject', *zemplěć* 'mill'.

The most important group is again verbs of transfer like *darić* 'present', *pósłać* 'send', *požćić* 'lend', *předpołożyć* 'submit', *přepodać* 'hand over',

*přepokazać* ‘transfer’, *přidželić* ‘allot, assign’, *připokazać* ‘allocate’, *připósłać* ‘send’, *sposrědkować* ‘convey’, *zaplaćić* ‘pay’, *zarunać* ‘compensate, refund’. In contrast to the Czech corpus, the highest frequency is displayed by the verbs *darić* ‘present’ and *(při)pósłać* ‘send’, which account for nearly a third of the examples, while in the Czech corpus there was no evidence at all for their Czech counterparts *darovat* ‘present’, *poslat*, *zaslat* ‘send’ (although the verbs are possible in the recipient passive according to Daneš):

- (10) *Kralowu gramatiku dóstach 5 lět*  
 K.POSS.ADJ.ACC.F.SG grammar.ACC.F.SG get.PRET.1.SG 5 years  
*pozdžišo wot awtora darjenu.*  
 later from author present.PTC.PASS.F.SG  
 ‘Kral’s grammar I got five years later from the author as a present.’
- (11) *Taj dwaj, wón rjekny, (...) dóstanjetaj papjery z*  
 These two, he said, get.2.DU.PRES papers.ACC.PL with  
*postom připósłane.*  
 post send.PTC.PASS.ACC.PL  
 ‘These two, he said, will get their papers sent by post.’

On the other hand, the verbs designating money transfers, which dominate in the Czech recipient passive, are represented much more weakly in the Upper Sorbian corpus.

- (12) *Dóstawam pravidlownje swoju rentu*  
 get.1.sg.pres regularly poss pension.acc.sg.f  
*přepokazanu a móžu sebi tak něštožkuli popřeć.*  
 transfer.PTC.PASS.F.SG and I can myself so many a thing permit  
 ‘I get my pension transferred regularly, and so I can permit myself many things.’
- (13) *Woni tola wšitko zaplaćene dóstanu.*  
 They after all everything pay.PTC.PASS.N.SG get.3.PL.PRES  
 ‘They will get paid everything, after all.’
- (14) *Ty dóstanješ puć zarunany*  
 You get.2.SG.PRES journey.ACC.SG.M. refund.PTC.PASS.M.SG  
*a něšto wosebiće k tomu.*  
 and something extra in addition.

‘You will get the expenses for the journey refunded and something extra in addition.’

There is a small group of further transfer verbs represented in the corpus:

- (15) *Tam dóstanje komponist melodije k wobdžělanju*  
 There get.3.SG.PRES composer melody.ACC.PL. to adaptation  
*předpoložene.*  
 submit.PTC.PASS.N.SG  
 ‘There the composer gets the melodies submitted in order to adapt them.’
- (16) *Knjez pismikistajeř(...) Arnošt Kummer w Budyšinje (...) je*  
 Mr. typesetter A. K. in B. AUX.3.SG  
*zańdženu srjedu přez knjeza měšćanostu dr. Zahna*  
 last Wednesday through Mr. mayor dr Z.  
*"čestne znamjo za swěru w džěle"*  
 “badge of honour.ACC.SG.N. for fidelity in work”  
*přepodate dóstał.*  
 confer.PTC.PASS.N.SG get.PERF  
 ‘Mr. typesetter Arnošt Kummer in Budyšin has been conferred a  
 “badge of honor for fidelity in work” by the mayor dr. Zahn last  
 Wednesday.’
- (17) *Z toho dósta kóždy přidžělene,*  
 From that get.3.sg.pret everyone allocate.PTC.PASS.N.SG  
*kelkož trjebaše.*  
 how much he needed.  
 ‘From that everyone got allocated as much as he needed.’
- (18) *Za to dyrbjachmy sebi wuhlo, drjewo a wšo, štož je trěbne,*  
 For that we had to ourself coal, wood and all, what is necessary  
*kupować, a štož druzy připokazane*  
 buy, and what others allocate.PTC.PASS.N.SG  
*dóstachu na marki (...)*  
 get.3.pl.pret on coupons  
 ‘For that we had to buy ourselves coal, wood and everything, what is  
 necessary, and what others got allocated on coupons.’

- (19) *Na tute wašnje smy drje jedyn chětro awtentiski*  
 In this way AUX.1.PL probably a quite authentic  
*wobraz wo Serbach sposrědkowany*  
 picture.ACC.SG.M about the Sorbs convey.PTC.PASS.M.SG  
*dóstali.*  
 get.PERF  
 ‘In this way we got conveyed a quite authentic picture about the  
 Sorbs, I suppose.’

There are a few verbs in the evidence that designate speech acts like  
 ‘approve, confirm, forgive, express (confidence)’:

- (20) *Za cyłkowny projekt, kiž płáči 300 tysac hriwnow,*  
 For the whole project, which costs 300 thousand deutschmark  
*je gmejna dóstala tele dny*  
 AUX.3.SG municipality get.PERF these days  
*spěchowanske srědki přizwolene.*  
 subsidies.ACC.PL approve.PTC.PASS.PL  
 ‘For the whole project, which costs 300’000 DM, the municipality  
 has got the subsidies approved these days.’
- (22) *Wón je tež hišće raz wobkrućene*  
 He AUX.3.SG. also once more confirm.PTC.PASS.N.SG  
*dostał, zo su jeho njewinowateho zajeli a zasudžili.*  
 get.PERF that they have him innocent arrested and sentenced  
 ‘He got confirmed once more that he was arrested and sentenced  
 while innocent.’
- (23) *Runje dže burowka z Božoho domu, je*  
 Just goes countrywoman from Lord’s house, AUX.3.SG  
*w sakramenće pokuty swoje hrěchi*  
 in sacrament of penance POSS sin.ACC.PL.M  
*wodate a swoju winu*  
 forgive.PTC.PASS.ACC.PL.M and POSS guilt.ACC.SG.F  
*pola Boha spuščenu dóstala.*  
 with God release.PTC.PASS.ACC.SG.F get.PERF  
 ‘A countrywoman is just going from the Lord’s house, and in the  
 Sacrament of Penance she was forgiven for her sins and released  
 from her guilt with God.’

- (24) *Za předsydu kandidowaštaj Marko Kowar z DSLK a dr. M. Völkel;*  
 For president were standing M. K. from DSLK and dr. M. V;  
*z wjetšinu hłosow dósta serbski wědomostnik*  
 with majority of voices get.3.sg.pret Sorbian scientist  
*z Instituta za serbski ludospyt dowěru*  
 from Institute of Sorbian ethnology confidence.acc.sg.f  
*wuprajenu*  
 express.PTC.PASS.ACC.SG.F  
 ‘Marko Kowar from DSLK and dr M. Völkel were running for president; with the majority of the voices the Sorbian scientist from the Institute of Sorbian ethnology got expressed confidence.’

There are some verbs in the evidence from the Upper Sorbian corpus, which do not seem to have a third actant in the dative. The dative, which occurs in the active construction, is rather an adjunct. Nevertheless, this adjunct can occur as subject of the recipient passive construction:

- (25) *Předstajichmy swój zwučeny program, spěwachmy, rejowachmy,*  
 We presented our common programme, we sang, danced,  
*dóstachmy bowlu naliwamu a*  
 get.1.PL.PRET punch.acc.sg.f pour.PTC.PASS.ACC.SG.F and  
*dyrbjachmy so wězo wot kurowych hosći wobdžiwać dać.*  
 we had to ourselves of course by spa visitors admire let  
 ‘We presented our common program, we sang, danced, we got punch poured, and, of course, we had to let ourselves be admired by the spa visitors.’
- (26) *W měšće (...) ramuje wobrazy, hišće ženje pak*  
 In town he frames pictures, yet never however  
*njeje niktó wot njeho wobraz*  
 NEG.AUX.3.SG nobody from him picture.ACC.SG.M  
*ramowany dóstał*  
 frame.PTC.PASS.ACC.SG.M GET.PERF  
 ‘In the town he frames pictures, but nobody got a picture framed from him until now.’

- (27) *Bohu džakowano, zo smy my tola časa dosć*  
 Thank God, that aux.1.pl we after all in time

<i>zemište</i>	<i>dóstali.</i>
mill.PTC.PASS.N.SG	get.PERF
'Thank God, that we got [our flour] milled in time, after all.'	

These constructions are reminiscent of the German sentence, in which the participle functions as a verbal attribute and the verb 'to get' retains its original meaning (Diewald's *Sie bekommt/kriegt/erhält die Bretter schon passend zugeschnitten* 'She gets the boards already cut up suitably'), so these are not examples showing strong grammaticalization.

The evidence from the Upper Sorbian corpus, when compared to the evidence from the Czech National Corpus, does not show stronger grammaticalization of the recipient passive in Standard Upper Sorbian than in Czech, with the exception of the higher relative frequency of the recipient passive construction. There are no verbs with privative meaning that are attested in the literature about the subject, and there are no noticeable objectless constructions of the type of German *geschrieben bekommen* 'get mail', *geschimpft bekommen* 'be told off', *auf die Füße getreten bekommen* 'to be trodden on one's foot' (while there is some evidence for such cases in the Czech material, cf. the examples with verbs meaning 'tell off', 'reproach' and 'give a person a hiding'). Most examples represented in the Upper Sorbian corpus are quite neutral in Standard German. The difference from the Czech recipient passive is mainly one of use: in Czech the recipient passive is mostly used with financial transactions, whereas in Upper Sorbian it is most often used with verbs such as *darować* 'present' or *připóslat* 'send'. It is not surprising that the analogous German constructions *geschenkt bekommen* and *zugeschickt bekommen* are merely neutral in style and occur very often (cf. Štícha 2004: 396; Glaser 2005: 54). In a few cases (especially from the magazine "Katolski pósoł" from the early 20th century) it seems that the Sorbian sentence would not be completely neutral in an analogous German text: cf. example 16, where *Herr Setzer Arnošt Kummer in Bautzen hat letzten Mittwoch ein „Ehrenzeichen für Treue bei der Arbeit“ von Bürgermeister Dr. Zahn übergeben bekommen* 'Mr. typesetter Arnošt Kummer in Budyšin has been conferred a "badge of honor for fidelity in work" by the mayor Dr. Zahn last Wednesday' might sound a bit too colloquial for a newspaper text. The same might be true for ex. 23). In order to give an exact answer to this question, however, it would be necessary to study comparable materials printed in German from the same time and area.<sup>21</sup>

This does not mean, of course, that the hypothesis of a stronger grammaticalization of the recipient passive in (Upper) Sorbian in

comparison to Czech is false. It means only that the use of the recipient passive that is attested in the corpus – which consists of written texts – is quite similar to the use in Standard German (with a certain regional shape, perhaps) and so it does not consist of constructions showing strong grammaticalization that occur in the (East) Middle German dialects, but are marked in Standard German. Such constructions do occur, however, in Sorbian dialects or in older written texts. A survey in a part of the “Serski powedar a kurier”,<sup>22</sup> the first Sorbian newspaper from the early 19th century, confirms Löttsch’s (1969: 106) impression that recipient passive constructions of verbs with privative meaning are quite usual:

- (28) *Na 30. Dez. jena 59 Ljet stara Wudowa we Regensburku*  
 The 30<sup>th</sup> Dec. one 59 years old widow in Regensburg  
*Lowu rubanu dofta (...)*  
 head.ACC.SG.F chop-off.PTC.PASS.ACC.SG.F get.3.SG.PRET  
 ‘The 30th of December, a 59-year-old widow in Regensburg got her head chopped off.’

These constructions, as observed several times, are regionally bound and stylistically not neutral in Standard German. It therefore seems that the use of the recipient passive in Upper Sorbian copies the use of (regional) German quite closely, stylistically as well as concerning grammaticalization. Strongly grammaticalized constructions are not neutral and so they occur in dialects and in texts written before the establishing of Modern Standard Upper Sorbian, but they merely do not occur in the corpus. It seems that extensive contact with German led not only to the birth of a new construction, but also to the copying of its different uses and stylistic interpretations.

## 5. The question of the history of the recipient passive in West Slavic

The evidence for the historical development of the recipient passive in Czech, Slovak, and Sorbian varies. For Upper Sorbian, it is clear that the construction existed in a strongly grammaticalized manner at least at the beginning of the 19<sup>th</sup> century, as was shown above. This corresponds, incidentally, to what is known about the development of the recipient passive in German: “Constructions with intransitive verbs as *geholfen bekommen* ‘get helped’ and main verbs with privative meaning as *entzogen bekommen* ‘get taken away’ considered both as a certain final point of the



development are attested at least from the begin of the 19<sup>th</sup> century and are not to be attributed to a later period only” (Glaser 2005: 45).<sup>23</sup> Šěrakowa (1998: 234) speaks of the forms of the type *dóstanu/krydnu prajene*, literally ‘I get told’, as “Germanisms, that settled down in the standard language from the 19<sup>th</sup> century on”. The Upper Sorbian Corpus, which contains texts by Jakub Bart-Ćišinski (1856-1909), a Sorbian writer with great importance for the development of Standard Upper Sorbian,<sup>24</sup> shows his use of the recipient passive in the second half of the 19<sup>th</sup> century (11 examples are his). The magazine “Katolski písoł” is represented with 17 examples from its volumes 1911-1914. On the other hand, the magazine “Rozhlad” is represented with 21 examples from its volumes 1990-2000, and the newspaper “Serbske nowiny” brings another 7 examples from its volumes 1999 and 2000.<sup>25</sup>

The partial corpus SYN2000 of the Czech National Corpus, from which the examples for the Czech recipient passive were actually found, is a synchronic corpus, which means that it contains mostly texts from the 1990s. There are, however, some classics of Czech literature, especially Karel Čapek (1890-1938), included; none of the authors were born before 1880. Since September 2005, however, the first version of the diachronic part of the Czech National Corpus has been available. It contains 700,000 words from texts ranging between the end of the 13<sup>th</sup> century through the 20<sup>th</sup> century. There is no complete lemmatization so far, which is why a query in the form of *dost.\**, *nedost.\**, *Dost.\**, and *Nedost.\** was made, delivering all words beginning in *dost-*, with and without a negative prefix. After manual reduction, there remained 283 forms of the verbs *dostávat* and *dostat*. None of these were combined with a participle, so no recipient passive construction could be found. The same holds for the database of Middle Czech, containing another 500,000 excerpts: among the 42 forms of *dostávat* and *dostat* no recipient passive is attested.<sup>26</sup> A further potential source is the dictionaries and historical grammars of Czech. I consulted the Old Czech dictionary of Gebauer (1903) and his historical Grammar (Gebauer 1929), the dictionary by Jungmann (1835), and the dictionary by Kott (1878-1901), without any positive results.<sup>27</sup> A recipient passive construction appears only in the PSJČ (I: 511):

- (29) *Rychtář*      *dostal*      *poručíno,*      *aby mě*  
 burgomaster    get.3.SG.PRET    command.PTC.PASS.N.SG    to me  
*dal chytit.*  
 have caught  
 ‘The burgomaster got the order to have me caught.’

The sentence is excerpted from a work by the author Alois Jirásek (1851-1930). There is one interesting detail about the recipient passive construction used in (29): it contains a participle in *-ino*, which today is marked as non-standard and restricted to most parts of Bohemia (without its most Northern and Western parts), the Southwest of Moravia and some villages of North Moravia (cf. ČJA 4: 584-589 and example 32 mentioned below).<sup>28</sup> Although at the moment I am unable to identify the exact work from which the excerpt originates, it is quite clear that this sentence is some years older than the sentence by Karel Čapek (1890-1938) found in SYN2000 (but quoted as early as in Daneš 1968: 281f.), which contains a further example:

- (30) *To číslo jsme už dostali*  
 This number.ACC.SG.N aux.1.pl already get.PERF  
*signalizováno z Chebu.*  
 signalize.PTC.PASS.N.SG from C.  
 ‘This number we already got signaled from Cheb.’

This sentence originates from Čapek’s work *Povídky z jedné kapsy* (*Tales from one pocket*); it is cited in the corpus from an edition in 1993, but the first edition dates from 1929.

The SSJČ (I: 379f.) offers no example for the recipient passive with the verb *dostat*, but with the imperfective verb *dostávat* there is the example *dostávat vynadáno* ‘be told off’.

It seems, therefore, that while in Upper Sorbian the recipient passive was fully developed at the beginning of the 19<sup>th</sup> century, in Czech it came into use only near the end of the century. In Slovak it is probably another 100 years younger (cf. Giger 2004, where it is noticed for the first time at all). It must be pointed out, however, that the frequency of the recipient passive as such is quite low, so it may be absent in smaller databases.<sup>29</sup>

## 6. Language contact and grammaticalization: Polysemy copying, replica grammaticalization, or parallel grammaticalization?

When trying to answer the question of how the recipient passive construction in West Slavic arose, the situation is different for each of the three languages considered. In Sorbian it is clear that it came into being in the dialects by direct loan of German *kriegen* ‘get’ > Sorbian *krydnyć*, *krydnuś* and loan translation of the construction with the participle. The

source of the construction can be found in the surrounding Middle German dialects with their strongly grammaticalized recipient passive (it should be recalled, as was pointed out in section 2, that it was this area where the German construction emerged in the 16<sup>th</sup>-17<sup>th</sup> century and at the beginning of the 19<sup>th</sup> century; its development had so far advanced that it made constructions with privative verbs possible). Evidence from the Sorbian dialects and from written Sorbian at the beginning of the 19<sup>th</sup> century speaks in favor of the validity of this hypothesis (cf. Löttsch 1969: 105). The recipient passive in Modern Standard Upper Sorbian relies on the dialectal constructions, all being influenced by stylistic factors of Standard German as well (cf. section 4). As there seem to be no significant differences between the Sorbian and the German construction as concerns grammaticalization,<sup>30</sup> we can consider it an instance of polysemy copying – including even stylistic differentiation – rather than of replica grammaticalization: the difference between replica grammaticalization and polysemy copying, according to Heine and Kuteva (2003: 555f., 2005: 80-108), can be explained as follows: while polysemy copying means that the replica language did not repeat the whole grammaticalization process of the model language, but its speakers made a “shortcut by simply copying the initial and the final stages of the process”, replica grammaticalization means that in the replica language the construction modeled according to a foreign pattern underlies a grammaticalization process of its own.<sup>31</sup> In the case of the Sorbian recipient passive, there might, perhaps, be a further possibility, not considered by Heine and Kuteva (2003, 2005): a parallel grammaticalization of a construction in model and replica language in a situation with a continually high bilingualism over a period of centuries.<sup>32</sup> Additionally, when considering the relation between recipient passive and direct passive in German and (dialectal) Sorbian, it can be argued further that in terms of Gast/van der Auwera (this volume) the interlingual identification of form-meaning pairings (verbs meaning ‘get’ and *n/t*-participles in German and Sorbian respectively and newly borrowed *wordować*, *wordować* < German *werden* as a copula and as passive auxiliary – but not as future auxiliary!) was accompanied by an interlingual identification of linguistic subsystems, namely the system of voice (compare also Nau this volume on the interrelatedness of phenomena in a very induced grammaticalization process).

The issue is much more complicated in Czech. If it is true that the recipient passive in Standard Czech came into being in the second half of the 19<sup>th</sup> century, we can imagine two possible paths: it can rest on Czech dialects, which built it on the model of the construction of neighboring

German dialects. It cannot be ruled out, however, that it was modeled in Colloquial and Standard Czech on the base of Standard German patterns (Standard German played an important role as the language of education in the Czech lands during the whole 19<sup>th</sup> century).

Let us consider the first hypothesis, namely that the source for the recipient passive in Czech must be sought in German dialects of Bohemia and Moravia. In this case we would have to account for differences between these dialects: Czech was surrounded until 1945 by Middle German dialects in the North (North West Bohemian, North Bohemian and North Moravian) and Upper German (Bavarian) dialects in the West and the South (South Bohemian, South Moravian). Especially for the Middle German dialects of North Bohemia we would expect a high degree of grammaticalization of the recipient passive (these dialects were direct neighbors of the Middle German dialects surrounding Upper Sorbian). On the one hand, we would expect a lesser degree of grammaticalization in the Bavarian dialects of West and South Bohemia and South Moravia (cf. Glaser 2005: 48). On the other hand, it is necessary to recall Glaser’s (2005: 49) remark on the examples for the recipient passive from former German dialects of Bohemia and Moravia in the database of the “Österreichisches Wörterbuch”. When considering this hypothesis it would be necessary to compare evidence from several Czech dialects. The relatively low frequency of the recipient passive, however, makes it difficult to get a representative picture. In the ČNT (1976), an anthology of Czech dialect texts of 400 pages, there are the following five examples:

- (31) „*Za peníze třeba kameňe do prdele budu tlouct, jen když*  
*dostanu zaplacení dobře!*“ (ČNT 1976: 148)  
 get.1.SG.PRES pay.PTC.PASS.N.SG well  
 ‘For money I will hammer even stones into the ass, if only I will get paid well.’
- (32) *Koleg gdo nasekl, tak toleg dostal zaplacino.*  
 How much who chopped so much get.3.SG.PRET pay.PTC.PASS.N.SG  
 (ČNT 1976: 163)  
 ‘As much one chopped, that much he got paid.’
- (33) *Ale potom zme dostali namalovani*  
 But then AUX.1.PL get.PRET paint.PTC.PASS.N.SG

*mi.* (ČNT 1976: 205)

we

‘But then it was us, who got a hiding.’

- (34) *Tac'inek se zbiroł na raňi do kostela a jo sem*  
 Dad left in the morning to the church and I AUX.1.SG  
*dostoł jaksepatřy nadane* (ČNT 1976: 316)  
 get.PRET properly tell-off.PTC.PASS.N.SG  
 ‘Dad left to the church in the morning, and me, I was properly told off.’

- (35) *No toš, ráno sem dostala*  
 So well, in the morning AUX.1.SG get.PRET  
*od tati nařezané.* (ČNT 1976: 369)  
 from dad thrash.PTC.PASS.N.SG  
 ‘Well, in the morning, I got a hiding from dad.’

(31) is from the Bohemian-Moravian transitional dialects (village Hartmanice); (32) is from the central part of the Hanakian (Central Moravian) dialects (village Příkazy, point 666 in the ČJA); (33) is from the Eastern part of the Hanakian (Central Moravian) dialects (village Záříčí, point 678 in the ČJA); (34) is from the Eastern (Ostravian) part of the Silesian dialects (village Paskov); and finally, (35) is from the town of Vsetín (point 72 in the ČJA) lying in the area of the Northern (Walachian) part of the Eastern Moravian dialects. So, in this survey, it looks as if the recipient passive construction would occur in Moravian rather than in Bohemian dialects. This, however, seems not quite plausible with respect to its occurrence in Standard and Colloquial Czech. The seeming non-occurrence of the construction in Bohemian dialects is presumably casual. The evidence available from the ČNT (1976) therefore cannot clearly show in which area the recipient passive came into being. As concerns semantics, the examples (31) – (35) are all current in Standard Czech as well (cf. section 3). With regard to the fact that the texts in the ČNT (1976) were recorded only in the 1970s, it cannot be ruled out that the few examples cited here are due to influence of Standard or Colloquial Czech.

When considering the hypothesis that the Czech recipient passive construction arose under the influence of Standard German, it must be stated that the strong productivity of the verbs meaning ‘tell off’ and ‘thrash’ does not correspond to the problematic status of such expressions in Standard German. On the other hand, they correspond well to such

expressions in Middle German and even Lower German dialects (cf. Glaser 2005: 50). Nevertheless, expressions like *gesagt bekommen* ‘get said’ or combinations of *dostat* with privative verbs are not possible in Czech, while in East Middle German (and Sorbian) they occur.

For these reasons it seems more plausible for Czech to see the rise of the recipient passive as an instance of replica grammaticalization (be it with Middle German dialects or Standard German as model language): there are quite evident traces of a grammaticalization history of its own. In the future, it will be necessary to research larger diachronic corpora of Czech, the Czech dialectological literature (especially older literature), and, of course, all available evidence from the former German dialects of Bohemia, Moravia, and Austrian Silesia.

For the recipient passive of Slovak it seems quite evident that it did not arise under direct influence of German, but under secondary influence of Czech (cf. Giger 2004). The fact that the construction is new, that there does not seem to be any evidence from Slovak dialects and that the constructions occurring in Slovak today perfectly resemble their Czech counterparts, speaks in favor of this hypothesis. So, from this point of view, the Slovak recipient passive looks like a further instance of polysemy copying. Nevertheless, the frequency of the construction is lower than in Czech and there are fewer verbs for which the construction is attested, which might also be a starting point for a replica grammaticalization that could show differences from Czech. Further development of the construction and research on the basis of larger corpora might provide an answer.

## 7. Conclusions

Among the domains in which German impact on its west Slavic neighboring languages can be detected is an important influence in the area of voice. In addition to the model of distinguishing passive and object resultative by auxiliaries meaning ‘become’ and ‘be’ that can be found in Sorbian, Polish, and (to some extent) in Kashubian and Slovincian, there is a model of distinguishing ‘direct’ (patient-promoting) and ‘indirect’ (recipient-promoting) passive by use of an auxiliary meaning ‘get’ in the latter. This model can be found in Sorbian, Czech, and Slovak. While in Sorbian the construction perfectly resembles its German counterpart (including stylistic differences between dialectal use and use in the standard language), in Czech there are some peculiarities in the choice of the full

verbs used in the recipient passive that do not agree with either Standard German or East Middle German dialects (as far as the situation in the latter is known). For these reasons, the process leading to the formation of the recipient passive can be analyzed as polysemy copying in Sorbian, but as replica grammaticalization in Czech. The model for the recipient passive in Slovak seems to be rather Czech than German.

## Notes

1. There is abundant literature on the subject, and there are other differences than those between event and state with the English *get-* and *be-*passive (e.g. style), which, however, do not need to be discussed here. Cf. Nolan (2001), Alexiadou (2005) with further references.
2. „Una chiara risposta a questa domanda si trova nella più volte citata *Grammatica italiana* di Luca Serianni (UTET 1989, Torino), capitolo XI dedicato al *Verbo*, numeri 14-16 del paragrafo che tratta dei verbi passivi. Serianni osserva che l'uso di *venire* (solo nei tempi semplici) in luogo del normale ausiliario *essere* conferisce alla frase il valore dinamico sottolineando un'azione: dire infatti *Alle ore 20 il museo viene chiuso* enuncia la programmatica azione di chiudere il museo, mentre dire *Alle ore 20 il museo è chiuso* costituisce una enunciazione ambigua che indica uno stato del museo alle ore 20 piuttosto che l'atto della sua chiusura.“ (Nencioni 2001) (“A clear answer to that question [concerning the use of the *venire-* and *essere-*passive, MG] can be found in the “Grammatica italiana” by Luca Serianni (UTET 1989, Torino), that has been cited several times, chapter XI dedicated to the *Verb*, number 14-16 of the paragraph which deals with passive verbs. Serianni observes that the use of *venire* (in simple tenses only) in stead of the normal auxiliary *essere* gives a dynamic valor to the sentence emphasizing an action: saying *Alle ore 20 il museo viene chiuso* ‘At eight o clock the museum gets closed’ recalls the programmatic action of closing the museum, while saying *Alle ore 20 il museo è chiuso* ‘At eight o clock the museum is closed’ establishes an ambiguous uttering which indicates a state of the museum at eight o clock rather than the act of its closing”).
3. This holds for the perfective aspect, although even here the complementary distribution is not as strong as it is between German *werden* and *sein* (cf. Wiemer 2004: 301, Wiemer and Giger 2005: 70f.); in the imperfective aspect, there is no opposition of auxiliaries (cf. Weiss 1977, 1982, Wiemer 1996).
4. There is some evidence for a similar loan in Kashubian. Its neighbor Slovincian showed a further type of German influence, namely the use of the future forms of the copula verb as an auxiliary in the passive under the influence of the polyfunctionality of German *werden* as future and passive auxiliary. Cf. Wiemer and Giger (2005: 83f.).

5. „Il passiv vegnan formaus cul verb auxiliar **vegnir** ed il **particip perfect** (...). Il diever digl auxiliar vegnir per formar il passiv lubescha da differenziar clar e bein il passiv ed igl adjectiv predicativ cun la muntada passiva dil particip: *Las stizuns vegnan serradas dallas sis e mesa* (passiv) – *Las stizuns ein serradas la dumengia* (adjectiv predicativ)“ (Spescha 1989: 413) (“The passive is formed by the auxiliary *vegnir* and the perfect participle (...). The use of the auxiliary *vegnir* in building the passive allows to distinguish clearly the passive from the predicative adjective with the passive meaning of the participle: *Las stizuns vegnan serradas dallas sis e mesa* ‘The shops get closed at half past six’ (passive) - *Las stizuns ein serradas la dumengia* ‘The shops are closed on sunday’ (predicative adjective)”). The “predicative adjective” in the second example is, of course, part of the resultative construction using the verb *esser* ‘to be’ as auxiliary. It is important to note that while Italian does not use the auxiliary *vegnire* ‘come’ in composed tenses, Retoromansh does, but not obligatorily: „Els temps cumponi vegn il verb auxiliar **vegnir** meinsvart era remplazzaus cul verb auxiliar **esser** (Spescha 1989: 414) (“In compound tenses the auxiliary *vegnir* is replaced sometimes by the auxiliary *esser*”).
6. The use of an auxiliary meaning ‘come’ in the dynamic passive is more of Romance origin than of Germanic and has even influenced Bavarian dialects of German, thus forming what Heine/Kuteva (2005: 186) call the ‘Alpine *come*-passive’, to which the Swiss Retoromansh construction belongs.
7. German played a certain role also in the development of dynamic passive in Scandinavian (North Germanic) languages: according to Weiss (1982: 205-208, with further references), a Middle Low German verb meaning ‘remain’ and – marginally – ‘become’ was borrowed into Scandinavian languages, leading there to a new participial dynamic passive unknown in Low German and replacing the original Scandinavian auxiliary that was etymologically identical with German dynamic passive auxiliary *werden* ‘become’ (at least in some varieties of Scandinavian this auxiliary was merging at that time – due to a language internal sound change – with the verb meaning ‘be’, a process that potentially might threaten the distinction between dynamic passive and object resultative).
8. „Dass die Konstruktion offenbar vom Luxemburgischen über das Pfälzische bis in die ostmitteldeutschen Dialekte hinein gut belegt ist, passt zu der geschilderten Rolle, die man dem Mitteldeutschen bei der Herausbildung des *kriegen*-Passivs zuschreibt, jedenfalls, wenn man davon ausgeht, dass die heutige Beliebtheit der Konstruktion mit den verschiedenen Verbtypen Reflex einer längeren Grammatikalisierungsgeschichte ist.“
9. „Diese Fakten zusammengekommen deuten darauf hin, dass das ‚bekommen‘-Passiv keine alte dialektale Verankerung besitzt und lassen vermuten, dass es sich um eine unter standardsprachlich-umgangssprachlichem Einfluss stehende Struktur handelt“ (Glaser 2005: 52). (“All these facts together suggest that the *bekommen*-passive did traditionally not exist [in the Swiss German dialects,



- MG] and lead to the assumption that it develops under the influence of Standard and Colloquial German”).
10. <http://www.korpus.cz/>
  11. Štícha (2005: 397) points out, that there is only one example in which the imperfective *dostávat* + participle has the meaning of an ongoing activity, in all other cases the imperfective aspect signals repetition of the action.
  12. These verbs have only two valencies, the nominative actor and the dative undergoer. This means, incidentally, that the recipient passive in Czech shows stage IV. of Ebert’s historical hierarchy cited in section 2., but it does not show stage III. (there is no recipient passive from verbs with deprivative meaning in Czech). This means that the stages invoked by Ebert are not universal.
  13. It has to be pointed out, however, that at least partially the lack of verbs is due to the size of the corpus: SYN2000 was a 100-million-words-corpus at the time of my research (2003). Štícha (2004: 396) postulates, that in a billion-words-corpus of Czech some of these “lacunae” would be filled. In the meantime the corpus SYN2009PUB has been published containing more than 750 million words. As it contains only journalistic texts, it might not be suitable for a research in the recipient passive.
  14. Cf. Giger (2004) for further references.
  15. <http://korpus.juls.savba.sk/>
  16. The absence of Czech *odpovědět* ‘answer’ and *slibit* ‘promise’, while Slovak *zodpovedať* and *sľúbiť* are attested in the recipient passive, is certainly casual.
  17. As most literature refers to Upper Sorbian and an electronic corpus was available only for Upper Sorbian at the time of the research for the present paper (2006), I will not try to describe the Lower Sorbian recipient passive separately. In the meantime, a Lower Sorbian corpus has been created (<http://www.dolnoserbski.de/korpus/>).
  18. <http://80.153.223.118/cgi-bin/corpus>. As the output of the Upper Sorbian corpus is heavily truncated when used online, I am indebted to Sonja Woelkowa from the Sorbian institute in Budyšin for making the concordances with the whole evidence of the verbs *dóstawać* and *dóstać* available to me.
  19. There is no reason to suppose that there are substantial differences in the frequency of these verbs in the two languages in question.
  20. An exact comparison with the recipient passive in the Slovak National corpus on the basis of the frequency of the verb *dostávat/dostat’* is not possible, because lemmatization was not available at the time when the research using the Slovak corpus was done (2003). I recall, however, the comparison of relative frequency between the recipient passive in Czech and Slovak on the basis of the size of the corpus as such. It is therefore clear that the relative frequency of the recipient passive is highest in the Upper Sorbian corpus, followed by the Czech corpus, and then the Slovak corpus.
  21. The question of regional variability in the use of the recipient passive in Standard German has not been addressed in detail so far (Glaser 2005: 46).

22. I am indebted to Katja Brankačkec (Prague) for the opportunity to search the electronic version of the text.
23. „Fügungen mit Intransitiva im Aktiv, wie *geholffen bekommen*, und mit privativer Semantik des Vollverbs, wie *entzogen bekommen*, die beide als ein gewisser Endpunkt in der Entwicklung angesehen werden, sind jedenfalls spätestens seit Beginn des 19. Jahrhunderts nachzuweisen und nicht erst einer jüngeren Zeit zuzuschreiben (...).“
24. Cf. Schulze (1996).
25. The “Serbske nowiny” are not included in the online-version of the corpus.
26. I am indebted to Petr Nejedlý (Prague), who made the excerpts available to me.
27. At this moment it is necessary to comment on the development of the verb *dostat* in Czech as such: according to Gebauer (1903: 307f.), in Old Czech there was only a reflexive construction *dostává se/ dostane se komu co / čeho*, in which the patient of the event ‘get’ stands in the nominative or genitive, while the recipient stands in the dative. Latter on, a non-reflexive verb *dostávat / dostat* occurs (cf. Jungmann 1835: 440-442), but until the 17<sup>th</sup> century its object stood overwhelmingly in the genitive (which is also the case in the Middle Czech database and in the diachronic part of the ČNK). At the end of the 17<sup>th</sup> century, grammarian Václav Jan Rosa states in his dictionary: “*dostanu, dostati, cum accus., etiam cum genit. (...): předce tu službu (l. té služby) dostal*” ‘*dostanu, dostati* with accusative, also with genitive: *After all he got this employment*ACC (or *this employment*GEN) (cf. Jungmann 1835: 440). Dobrovský (1809/1940: 702, 705) notes, that *dostati* has the genitive as an object case, but also the accusative, “especially with newer authors”. It is important to realize that a verb meaning ‘get’ and combining with the accusative (analogous to German *kriegen, bekommen*) had only to develop in Czech before it could eventually be used in a loan translation of the German recipient passive. The same picture can be seen in Slovak: excerpting the texts used by Miriam Giger-Sitárová (2004) – court documents from Trnava from the 16<sup>th</sup>-18<sup>th</sup> century – shows that in the 16<sup>th</sup> and 17<sup>th</sup> century *dostat’ sa niekomu* (reflexive verb with the recipient in the dative) and *dostat’ niečoho* (non-reflexive verb with the recipient in the nominative and the object in the genitive) can be found, along with *dostat’ niečo* (the object in the accusative), while in the 18<sup>th</sup> century only the latter occurs.
28. Yet it is necessary to point out that at the beginning of the 19<sup>th</sup> century this form was not markedly substandard. Dobrovský (1809/1940: 610) offers examples of forms in *-in* without negative appreciation (and even in the masculine gender, which is impossible today): *odjn, zawřjn, placino* (in modern orthography *odín, zavřín, placino*). The process by which these forms became substandard and limited to the neutral gender in contexts where they mark lack of agreement (cf. Giger 2003a: 80, 402f., 464, 2003b: 58), has not been investigated so far. It is therefore – especially without knowledge of the context – not possible to characterize Jirásek’s sentence in an unambiguous manner.

29. The 100-million-word corpus SYN2000 gave around 550 examples, so the diachronic part of the Czech National Corpus, which contained 700'000 words in 2006, might have given 3-4 examples, with the same relative frequency presumed. Lower frequency or textual reasons can lead to a complete absence, which does not necessarily prove the non-existence of the construction at the given time.
30. It is important to notice the difference to the possessive resultative with Upper Sorbian *měć*, Lower Sorbian *měś* 'have'+ participle, which – although grammatically in a close relation to the recipient passive – is in no way comparable to the German perfect as far as the degree of grammaticalization is concerned (cf. Giger 2003a: 480-485; Wiemer and Giger 2005: 101-106).
31. Heine and Kuteva (ibid.) deal with a third possibility of contact induced grammaticalization, ordinary contact induced grammaticalization in the replica language, in case that the replica language builds a grammatical category existing in the model language, but no grammaticalization process to be repeated can be found in the model language (cf. also Gast and van der Auwera, this volume). As this clearly is not the case for the German source of the West Slavic recipient passive, this possibility does not need to be considered here.
32. See Matras (2009, esp. 72-74 and 238-274 for a theory of language convergence anchored in a theory of bilingualism. The preconditions mentioned by Yatras (2009: 273) may well have been relevant for early Modern Sorbian: bilingual speakers are fairly uninhibited to generalize patterns across their linguistic repertoire, but are relatively conscious of contextually appropriate selection of word-forms and there is lax societal control over the spread of innovations leading to language change, while at the same time loyalty to the replica language ensures language maintenance.

## References

- Alexiadou, Artemis  
 2005 A note on non-canonical passives: The case of the *get*-passive. In *Festschrift für Henk van Riemsdijk*, Hans Broekhuis et al. (eds.), 13-21. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Aske, John Ole  
 1984 Grammatikalisierung und Auxiliarisierung im sogenannten "bekommen/kriegen/erhalten" – Passiv des Deutschen. *Kopenhagener Beiträge zur germanistischen Linguistik* 22: 5-47.
- ČJA  
 2002 *Český jazykový atlas. 4* [Czech Language Atlas]. Praha: Academia.

- ČNT  
 1976 *České nářeční texty* [Czech Dialectal Texts]. Praha: Státní pedagogické nakladatelství.
- Csató, Eva Agnes  
 1994 Tense and Actionality in Hungarian. In *Tense Systems in European Languages*, Rolf Thieroff and Joachim Ballweg (eds.), 231-246. (Linguistische Arbeiten 308) Tübingen: Niemeyer.
- Daneš, František  
 1968 *Dostal jsem přidáno* a podobné pasívní konstrukce [*Dostal jsem přidáno* and similar passive constructions]. *Naše řeč* 51: 269-290.
- Daneš, František  
 1976 Semantische Struktur des Verbs und das indirekte Passiv im Tschechischen und Deutschen. In *Satzstruktur und Genus verbi*, Ronald Löttsch and Rudolf Růžička (Hrsg.), 113-124. (Studia grammatica 13) Berlin: Akademie-Verlag.
- Diewald, Gabriele  
 1997 *Grammatikalisierung. Eine Einführung in Sein und Werden grammatischer Formen*. (Germanistische Arbeitshefte 36) Tübingen: Niemeyer.
- Dobrovský, Josef  
 1940 [1809] Podrobná mluvnice jazyka českého v redakcích z roku 1809 a 1819 [Detailed grammar of Czech in the redactions of 1809 and 1819]. Praha: Komise pro vydávání spisů Josefa Dobrovského při Královské české společnosti nauk.
- Ebert, Robert Peter  
 1978 *Historische Syntax des Deutschen*. (Sammlung Metzler 167) Stuttgart: Metzler
- Faßke, Helmut, and Siegfried Michalk  
 1981 *Grammatik der obersorbischen Schriftsprache der Gegenwart*. Bautzen: Domowina.
- Gast, Volker, and Johan van der Auwera, J.  
 this vol. What is 'contact-induced grammaticalization'? Evidence from Mayan and Mixe-Zoquean languages.
- Gebauer, Jan  
 1903 *Slovník staročeský. I A-J* [Old Czech Dictionary]. Praha: Česká Akademie císaře Františka Josefa pro vědy, slovesnost a umění a Česká Grafická Společnost "Unie".
- Gebauer, Jan  
 1929 *Historická mluvnice jazyka českého. IV. Skladba* [Historical Grammar of Czech. IV. Syntax]. Praha: Česká akademie věd a umění.

- Giger, Markus  
2003a *Resultativkonstruktionen im modernen Tschechischen (unter Berücksichtigung der Sprachgeschichte und der übrigen slavischen Sprachen)*. (Slavica Helvetica 69) Bern etc.: Peter Lang.
- Giger, Markus  
2003b Die Grammatikalisierung des Rezipientenpassivs im Tschechischen, Slovakischen und Sorbischen. In *Contributions suisses au XIIIe congrès mondial des slavistes à Ljubljana, août 2003*, P. Sériot (éd.), 79-102. (Slavica Helvetica 70) Bern etc.: Peter Lang.
- Giger, Markus  
2004 Recipientné pasívum v slovenčine [The recipient passive in Slovak]. *Slovenská reč* 69: 37-43.
- Giger, Markus  
2006 On delimitation of analytic verbal forms (on the basis of three West Slavic constructions) *Slavia* 75: 259-271.
- Giger-Sitárová, Miriam  
2004 *Lexika a štýl administratívno-právnych textov zo 16.-18. storočia* [Lexicon and style of administrative-legal documents of the 16th – 18th century]. Bratislava. (unpublished PhD thesis, Jazykovedný ústav Ľudovíta Štúra SAV, Bratislava).
- Glaser, Elvira  
2005 *Krieg und kriegten: Zur Arealität der BEKOMMEN-Periphrasen*. In „*Krieg und Frieden*“ – Auseinandersetzung und Versöhnung in Diskursen, Ulla Kleinberger Günther, Annelies Häcki Buhofer, and Elisabeth Piirainen (Hrsg.), 43-64. Tübingen: Francke.
- Haspelmath, Martin  
1998 How young is Standard Average European? *Language Sciences* 20: 271-287.
- Haspelmath, Martin  
2001 The European linguistic area: Standard Average European. In *Language Typology and Language Universals. An International Handbook*, Martin Haspelmath, Ekkehard König, Wulf Oesterreicher, and Wolfgang Raible (eds.), 1492-1510. (Handbücher zur Sprach- und Kommunikationswissenschaft 20) Berlin-NewYork: de Gruyter.
- Heine, Bernd, and Tania Kuteva  
2003 On contact induced grammaticalization. *Studies in Language* 27: 529-572.
- Heine, Bernd, and Tania Kuteva  
2005 *Language Contact and Grammatical Change*. Cambridge: University Press.
- Jungmann, Josef  
1835-39 *Slowník česko-německý. I A-J* [Czech-German Dictionary. I. A-J]. Praha: Josefa wdowa Fetterlowá, řizenjm Wáclava Špinky.

- Kott, František  
1878-1901 *Česko-německý slovník zvláště grammaticko-fraseologický. I-VIII + Dodatky I-III* [Czech-German Dictionary, especially grammatical and phraseological. I-VIII + additions I-III]. Praha: Kolář.
- Lötzsch, Roland  
1968 Někotre wuskutki němskeho wliwa na werbalny system serbšćiny [Some results of the German influence on the verbal system of Sorbian]. In *Přinoški k serbskemu řečespytej / Beiträge zur sorbischen Sprachwissenschaft*, Helmut Fasske, and Roland Lötzsch (red.), 337-344. Budyšin/Bautzen: Domowina.
- Lötzsch, Roland  
1969 Zum indirekten Passiv im Deutschen und Slawischen. In *Slawisch-deutsche Wechselbeziehungen in Sprache, Literatur und Kultur*, Werner Krauss, Zdzisław Stieber, Jaromír Bělič and V. I. Borkovskij. (Hrsg.), 102-109. (Veröffentlichungen des Instituts für Slawistik 44) Berlin: Akademie-Verlag.
- Matras, Yaron  
2009 *Language contact*. Cambridge etc.: Cambridge University Press.
- Nau, Nicole  
this vol. Modality in an areal context: The case of a Latgalian dialect.
- Nedjalkov, Vladimir P., and S. E. Jaxontov  
1988 The typology of resultative constructions. In *Typology of resultative constructions*, Vladimir P. Nedjalkov (ed.), 3-63. (Typological Studies in Language 12) Amsterdam-Philadelphia: Benjamins.
- Nencioni, Giovanni  
2001 Formazione di frasi passive con *andare* e *venire*. *La Crusca per voi* 23: 9-10.
- Nolan, Brian  
2001 Passive Voice Constructions in Modern Irish. *ITB Journal* 3: 51-78.
- PSJČ  
1935-37 *Příruční slovník jazyka českého. I A-J* [Concise dictionary of the Czech language. I. A-J]. Státní nakladatelství.
- Schulze, Jana  
1996 *Die Entstehung und Entwicklung einer einheitlichen obersorbischen Schriftsprache im 19. Jahrhundert und der Beitrag des Dichters Jakub Bart-Čišinski zu ihrer endgültigen Konsolidierung und Durchsetzung*. Leipzig: Universität Leipzig.
- Šerakowa, Irena  
1998 Syntaksa [Syntax]. In *Serbščina*, Helmut Faska (red.), 228-238. (Najnowsze dzieje języków słowiańskich) Opole: Uniwersytet Opolski – Instytut Filologii Polskiej.

- Spescha, Arnold  
 1989 *Grammatica sursilvana*. Cuera: Casa editura per mieds d'instrucziun.
- SSJČ  
 1960 *Slovník spisovného jazyka českého. I. A- M* [Dictionary of the literary Czech language. I. A-M]. Praha: Nakladatelství československé akademie věd.
- Štícha, František  
 2004 Opisné pasivní konstrukce s relátorem *dostat* a trpným participiem v současné češtině: úzus a gramatičnost [Periphrastic passive constructions with the relator *dostat* and a passive participle: Use and grammaticality]. In *Čeština – univerzálie a specifika 5*, Zdeňka Hladká and Peter Karlík (eds.), 391-398. Praha: Lidové noviny.
- Vogel, Petra M.  
 2006 *Das unpersönliche Passiv. Eine funktionale Untersuchung unter besonderer Berücksichtigung des Deutschen und seiner historischen Entwicklung*. Berlin – New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Weiss, Daniel  
 1982 Deutsch-polnische Lehnbeziehungen im Bereich der Passivbildung. In *Literatur- und Sprachentwicklung in Osteuropa im 20. Jahrhundert. Ausgewählte Beiträge zum Zweiten Weltkongreß für Sowjet- und Osteuropastudien*, Eberhard Reißner (ed.), 197-218. (Osteuropaforschung 4) Berlin: Berlin Verlag.
- Wiemer, Björn  
 1996 Analityczne passivum w języku rosyjskim i polskim [Analytical passive in Russian and Polish]. In *Semantyka a konfrontacja językowa 1*, Violetta Koseska-Toszeza (red.), 167-178. Warszawa: SOW.
- Wiemer, Björn  
 2004 The evolution of passives as grammatical constructions in Northern Slavic and Baltic languages. In *What makes Grammaticalization? A Look from its Fringes and its Components*, Walter Bisang, Nikolaus P. Himmelmann, and Björn Wiemer (eds.), 271-331. (Trends in linguistics. Studies and monographs 158) Berlin – New York: Mouton de Gruyter
- Wiemer, Björn, and Markus Giger  
 2005 *Resultativa in den nordslavischen und baltischen Sprachen. Bestandsaufnahme unter arealen und grammatikalisierungstheoretischen Gesichtspunkten*. (LINCOM Studies in Language Typology 10) München: Lincom.